

Speculum Sarisburianum,

I N
R E M A R K S
O N

Some Passages in a Pamphlet,

Entituled,

An Introduction to the Third Volume of the
History of the Reformation of the Church of
England. By the Right Reverend Father
in GOD, *Gilbert*, Lord Bishop of *Sarum*.

In a LETTER to a Friend.

By PHILOCLERUS.

With a *Postscript* containing some Reflections on the
Preface introductory to his Lordship's Sermons,
preach'd on several Occasions, &c. lately publish'd.

In the *Earl of Danby's Tryal*, the *Author* shews us, Many
Books came out likewise against the Church of *England*.
This alarmed the Bishops and Clergy much, so that they set
up to preach against Rebellion and the late Times in such a
Strain, that it was visible they meant a Parallel between
those and the present Times; and this produced at last that
Heat and Rage, into which the Clergy has run so far, that
it is like to end very fatally. They on their Part should
have shewn more Temper, and more of the Spirit of the
Gospel, whereas for the greatest Part, they are the worst
Natur'd, the fiercest, indiscreetest, and most persecuting
Sort of People that are in the Nation. *MS. History repre-*
senting the Affairs of Church and State within Britain and Ire-
land in the Author's time.

LONDON: Printed for J. Morphew, near Sta-
tioners-Hall. MDCCXIV.



I
t
a
t
f
c
P
P
w
R
du
an

Speculum Sarisburianum, &c.

S I R,

THE frequent and hasty Repetitions of such Prefaces and Introductions by this Author (no less than three new ones in about one Year's time, besides an old Serviceable one re-publish'd, concerning Persecution, before his Translation of *Lactantius* of the Deaths of the primitive Persecutors, first printed at *Amsterdam*, 1687. for the use of *London*, and this Year at *London* for the use of *Amsterdam*; to which I have seen an excellent Reply made just after its first Publication, in MS. which I hope the Possessor will now oblige the World with. The frequent, I say, and hasty Repetitions of such Prefaces and Introductions,) assure your self, are Preludes and Introductions to other practical

A 2

Things,

Things, besides *Pastoral Cares, Sermons, and Histories*. All this Noise is not for nothing. It is either the effect of a full Assurance in the Resurrection of the *Good Old Cause*, which would never breathe, were it not for those two Words, Popery and Persecution, or of an utter Dependancy, Fear and Rage. But which ever of the Two it be, the World ought to look about them in Time, when Fire-brands, Arrows and Death, are thus indiscriminately thrown about. In the Preface to the *Pastoral Care*, the Queen and Government are substantially vilify'd, and *p. 18.* bullied with Providence, and new Revolutions; in this, *p. 67, 68.* both Houses of Parliament are called upon and threatned, if they do *the Work of the Lord negligently*, with popular or foreign Reformation and Security; with Vengeance divine and human. What Person dared to talk at this rate, who was not either mad or outrageous, or did not think himself strong, and the Government weak? Since Advertisements in the *Gazette* would have done as well or better, and he owns they have been of great Use to him, there was no occasion, as is pretended, for this separate Introduction before the Publication of the Book,

Book, unless it be to serve other ends, than the History of the Reformation, I mean to begin a new One. The true Reason then seems to be this, That such an Introduction might easily come into more People's Hands, and sooner than if it was only printed before the Volume, which possibly may not be publish'd till after some time; and perhaps his Lordship may think the least delays dangerous to his Cause.

I shall make my Remarks to you, *Sir*, as the Places to be remarked on, lie in order in the Book.

P. 7. His Lordship saith, That when he desired, thro' the Intercession of the
 " present Bishop of *Worcester*, leave of
 " access to the *Cotton* Library, a great
 " Prelate had before hand possess'd Sir
 " *John* with such Prejudices against him,
 " as being no Friend to the Prerogative
 " of the Crown, nor to the Constituti-
 " on of our Church, — nor could
 " that Reverend Person prevail with
 " Archbishop *Sancroft* to interpose.
 And if so, no doubt, it was denied by
 the good Archbishop for the same Rea-
 sons. And has not his Lordship plentifully
 justify'd the Judgments of those great
 Prelates concerning him, *that he was*

no Friend to the Prerogative of the Crown, nor to the Constitution of the Church? If this be questioned, read some of his modern Sermons, Speeches, Expositions, and Prefaces. What did he tell this Story for, unless to expose himself, and vindicate those Prelates? This very Introduction is a signal Proof of the Charge. Which Prelates do you think, *Sir*, will be found to have had the truest Spirit of Prophecy; those who foresaw this disaffection to Church and State, or those who Prophesied of Popery, the one of the downfall of it in general, the other of the speedy exaltation of it here? But after all, the Access to the Library by *Sir John's* leave at last obtained, which the *Bishop* mentions p. 11. was owing solely to the Recommendation of Archbishop *Sangroft* (whatever the Motive to it was) as I have been lately inform'd by some of the Family, who are ready to attest it; and that he was received most obligingly in *Sir John's* Family, whilst he had occasion to make use of the Library, and that this happened within a very short time after his first repulse, and not after so long a time as his Lordship insinuates.

“ P. 15. I imputed this, saith his
 “ Lordship, (meaning Mr. *Le Grand's*
 “ Treatment of him) to a management
 “ he was under by some of the Court
 “ of that unfortunate Prince, who
 “ soon after felt the tragical Effects of
 “ such unhappy Counsellors, as had
 “ then the Ascendant. Had it not been
 for those Counsellors, his Lordship had
 never been where, nor what he is.
 There was a Mystery in all that, which
 is not so at this time of the day. Some
 of those Counsellors ill Advised that un-
 fortunate Prince out of another Design
 than what his Lordship would have the
 World believe; to render him odious
 to his People, to facilitate----, and to
 obtain the Purse of *England* to carry
 on a War against *France*, which that un-
 provoked Prince was not inclinable to
 do; which would not have been so
 easily accomplished, had that Prince re-
 gularly Govern'd. Pray, how many
 evil Counsellors were punish'd for it,
 as the World expected they should have
 been, tho' King *William* had several of
 them in his Hands? The Fish was
 caught, and all was well. I am of O-
 pinion, had King *James* enter'd into
 that War, he would not have so easily

abdicated, tho' he had been Guilty of some considerable Transgressions; and that then some of those very Ministers would have advised him to have Governed according to Law, and to have shewed greater Countenance and Favour to the established Church, as the surest Means to support him on his Throne, they would then have given Advice contrary to what they did; I do not mean out of a Principle of Conscience, Honour, or Honesty, but of human and hypocritical Policy, for which a new Convert (reconverted and rewarded, when it was time to take off the Mask,) was so remarkably famed. *Sed jacta fuit alea.*

From p. 21 to the 24th inclusively, the Bishop falls on Mr. *Wharton*, whom
 “ he knows to be the Author of the Specimen of some Errors and Defects in
 “ the History of the Reformation of
 “ the Church of *England*, under the
 “ borrowed name of *Anthony Harmer*. His Lordship tells some Stories of him not much to his Credit; but Mr. *Wharton* is dead, *non loquitur*, and his Lordship hath not produced living Vouchers, or other sufficient Evidence for what he so confidently affirms; and so I will say

say of him, as he doth of Mr. *Wharton* p. 93, (and I will presently subjoin a substantial Reason for it even from this very Introduction,) *where I see a Voucher for any thing that he affirms, I will submit and own my error, but I have no reason to take any thing on his word: And since in relation to what should chiefly affect Mr. Wharton's Reputation here, he cites only Archbishop Tillotson, his Lordship ought to remember his own saying, delivered in the 114th p. of his Vindication from a Pamphlet, Entituled, Some Discourses upon Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson, &c. "It is a Practice " too gross, and too much decried, to " lay a Story so, that it must end in " a dead Man." But to the reason of my Infidelity without a collateral Voucher, from this very Introduction, p. 70. his Lordship saith, " Their Devotions (i. e. of the Romish Church, as Popish, or else it is nothing to the Purpose, and so he may find Popery in good Part of our Liturgy, as you know, not so wise People as the Bishop have done before, for the Liturgy is but the Service of the Popish Church of England, reformed,) are openly recommended, and an Union with the*
" Gal.

“ *Gallican Church* has been impudently
 “ proposed. This is to be transmitted
 gravely to Posterity; introducing a third
 Volume of the *History of the Reformation*,
 which the Author pretends, shall not
 only be an Addition to his two other
 Volumes, but a Correction of their
 Mistakes too.

The Devotions openly recommended,
 every one will know are the Reformed
 ones by Dr. *Hickes*, which have passed
 a fourth Edition with great Applause,
 in a Protestant Country, and are ready
 for a fifth, (unless he means some others
 too, published by his Brother the Dean
 of *Canterbury*;) And by *the Union with*
the Gallican Church being impudently pro-
posed, he must understand the Proposal
 in the *Regale and Pontificate* by Mr.
Lesley. Now would not a perfect Stran-
 ger imagine, he should find Prayers to
 Saints and Angels in the one, with other
 Popish Corruptions, recommended; and
 in the other a Project to unite with the
 Church of *France*, on the Terms of
 Popery? and yet after all there is not
 the least bit of Popery in either. Is not
 this a pretty Writer, to keep such a
 noise about Popery, when either he
 knows not what it is, or grossly mistakes

in his Tales? And since mention hath been made of *the Reformed Devotions*, give me leave, *Sir*, to tell you, that the Publication of them gave such an Idea of the Pious and Reverend Editor to the learned *Dr. Grabe*, that it was a principal motive for the Foundation of the intimate and lasting Friendship that was between those two great Men. But perhaps it may be thought *Dr. Grabe* was not an equal Judge; he may be called Popishly affected himself, for he was of a Country, which sued for true primitive Episcopacy; but to the immortal Honour of some Bishops (and it is an Original) the Request was Gravely and very Christianly declined. It was not seasonable. It would have disoblighed our Whigs and Dissenters at home; and better that a whole Nation should lose the only true and regular Mission, than those tender little ones should be offended. I hope, greater regard will be had to our own *American* Plantations, the Inhabitants of which have for some Years passionately address'd for a local Episcopacy, which will be greatly conducive not only to the State of their Religion, but of their Learning too.

A

A castration of every thing Popish and offensive hath passed on the Devotions; and the Proposal is very Honest and Catholick, (much more so than some modern Methods of Comprehension,) for the *Gallican* Church to leave off Popery entirely in all her Terms of publick Communion, and come down to our Reformation; not for us in the least to return to their Corruptions in it. This, I think, I may justly charge on the Bishop as wilful, so as to render him not to be credited solely on his own Word. *I have ever looked on falsehoods in History* (saith his Lordship, p. 26.) *when fallen into deliberately, as the worst sort of lying, both the most publick and the most lasting.* Let him disprove what I now charge on him, if he can, either as to Dr. *Hicke's* (or Dr. *Stanhope's*) Performances, or Mr. *Lesley's* Proposal, or say, (but let him prove it too) that he could mean other Persons and Performances; but if he cannot, let him remember his own Words just now quoted. No People used to charge those reformed Devotions, and the Proposal with Popery, but such as the ingenious and veracious *Observer*, and *Flying-Post*. I am sorry to find the Bi-
shop

shop of *Sarum* fallen so low; this is Low Church indeed. It was more pardonable in them, than in a Bishop, who always pretends to, or should speak exact Truth: But Dr. *Hickes* and Mr. *Lesley* are intolerable to some People, and must be rendred Popish, or Popishly affected, (as the Word was in Archbishop *Laud's* Days, and that a Bishop should now help on the cry, is admirable,) tho' no Men of the Age, (no, not even the Author of *the History of the Reformation*) have done more Service for the Church of *England*, and against Popery, than they. I charge this Author with the Knowledge of it. Cannot his Lordship's Cunning find out Popery in *the Case* lately *Stated* too? This Accusation will be believ'd to be deliberate, and something else, until his Lordship proves what he says. And I, with his Lordship, would perswade an *intimate Friend* of his, since his Hand is in at Correction of Histories, to correct a certain Secret History, (some People's Histories are to be Secret, till they think, or at least hope, they cannot be disprov'd,) for it is in his Power, a Specimen of which I have seen, one of the newdeft Libels ever dropt from the most
ma-

malicious Pen, Copied by a Transcriber, with just and pertinent Remarks by the same Hand; in which are several notorious Falshoods deliberately and maliciously fallen into. The History is fraught with *the worst sort of Lying*; I wish it were now *Publick*, that it might be the less *Lasting*. But from this long, but necessary Digression, to return to Mr. *Wharton*. " P. 21. saith the Bishop, He " pretended that he had many more " Errors in reserve, and that this Specimen was only a hasty Collection of a " few out of many other Discoveries he " could make. And p. 23. I despised " that offer, but said, that I would at " any Price buy of him those Discoveries that he pretended to have in reserve. " That Mr. *Wharton* ever owned; he had yet other Discoveries in reserve, doth not appear, as far as I can learn, but from the Bishop, without a Voucher. Mr. *Chiswell*, p. 23. (at whose House he then lay, being Sick) said, *He could draw nothing of that from him, and he believ'd he had nothing*: And in the very Preface to the Specimen, which was publish'd in the Year before Mr. *Wharton* died, for he died in the latter End of 1694. so that considering the

short-

shortness of Time between the Publication of the Specimen, which was at the Beginning of 93, and the Death of Mr. *Wharton* in the latter End of 94, preceded by a lingering Sickness, (for his Illness at Mr. *Chiswell's* was a Year before he died) which would incapacitate for searches of that nature, such a Reserve made, seems improbable; the Author owns no such certain Reserve, but seems to intimate the quite contrary, saying, p. 7, 8. " It ought not, nor can " it be supposed, that I have discovered, " and in these Papers published, all the " Errors committed in this History : I " have indeed read the whole, but have " not had Opportunity to Examine the " Truth of a third Part of it. In that " small Part which I have Examined, I " have detected all the following Mistakes, (for which reason I call it a Specimen) so that if I had present leisure and means to pursue the Examination throughout ; I could scarce hope to find the remaining Part free from Errors. But I would not bestow too much time upon it ; nor if I would, do I enjoy yet fit Opportunity. All this seems to imply, that he had then no farther actual reserve, but only thought

thought, that on a thorough Examination of the whole, (for he professes, he had not Examined a third Part) a great many more Errors might be discovered. This is far from an actual reserve, with which the Bishop charges him, that he might delay his Reply to the Specimen, or submit ; but only a Potential one, probably to be Collected from his Observations to be made on the remaining Part of his Lordship's History. But whether this were so or not, it will not be amiss to let the World know, that an admirable Reply to his Lordship's Answer to *Anthony Harmer* was seized at the Press, and never suffered to see the Light, which might otherwise have given full satisfaction as to that Book.

“ This Collection consisted (the Bishop goes on) of some trifling and minute differences in some Dates and Trans- actions of no importance, upon which nothing depended. ” 'Tis true, a great many of the Errors urged by *Anthony Harmer*, are purely Chronological, yet even Chronological Mistakes (for what is History but Chronology ?) in such an History may, and doth oftentimes, lead the Reader and Posterity into dangerous and confused Errors. They

are

are not all trifling and minute differences, and of no importance, upon which nothing depended, as his Lordship's imputed Mistakes shew, concerning the notoriety and scandalous Excess of Lewdness, which *Harmer* has extenuated in some, and denied of others, unless it be a small Matter to blast the Reputation of an unsound Church by non-authentick Stories. I hope the Bishop will vindicate himself from the Errors and Defects imputed By *Anthony Harmer*, but if he cannot, they will not all be found to be Minute, and of the least Consequence.

P. 29. His Lordship saith, *The whole was writ with so much Malice, and such Contempt.* p. 6. of his Preface, *Harmer* says, *The only reasons which have drawn me to this Undertaking, are the love of Truth, and concern for the Honour of the Reformation of our Church, &c.* The Motives and End of his Writing were certainly and apparently honest and laudable; and if he hath interspersed a little Satyr amongst his Discoveries, this Author, at least, ought to bear it as patiently as any Body, who by his intemperate and contemptuous Expressions for a long time, but more especially of late, *universo clero bellum indixerit*: I will bring his Lord-

B

Ship

ship for my Voucher. He cannot forbear even in this Introduction, in which he complains of the Malice and Contempt of another, to treat the whole Priesthood in a lump with the utmost Disgrace and Scorn. P. 51: saith his Lordship, *I confess, I am not inclin'd to expect much from the Assemblies of Clergymen.* This is *alamode* Secret History. Could a *Julian* or a *Judas* have said worse? And a little below, (that you may believe, he thinks as bad of the Reformed, as of the Unreformed Conventions, and that you may shake them both in a Bag together,) he saith, *What has happened among our selves of late, has not made me of another Mind.* And again, p- 57. *If the Principles of Truth, Justice, Temperance, and of universal Love, do not govern Men, they will soon grow Curses and Plagues to one another; and a Crew of Priests, (without either Truth, Justice, Temperance, or Love) will grow up, who will teach them to compound for all Crimes, &c.* A Crew of Priests! doth not this seem to be wrote with Malice and Contempt enough? And let not his Lordship think to excuse himself by saying, They were popish Priests; tho' Popish, they were still Christian Priests. A Crew of Priests!

Priests! Words fitter to fall from the Pen of a *T---nd*, or a *G---ns*, than from a Bishop. This is Priestcraft in Perfection. I would not have the Introducer presently set up his Voice, and call me Papist, or Popishly affected for this, for I am as much in earnest against Popery as his Lordship can be. I believe the Church of *Rome* to be the most un-sound and corrupt Part of the Catholick Church upon Earth. She seems contriving on purpose to see how far human Sense and Reason can be imposed upon, as in the famous Instances of Transubstantiation, Prayer in an unknown Tongue, and the mutilated Eucharist; and he that but slenderly considers the *New Testament*, can never believe Popery can be proved from it; he must disbelieve the one or the other: yet since it is a Christian Church, (as a Monster may be a Man) and hath all the essentially constituent Parts of a Church, the Priesthood of it ought to be treated with decency and good Manners; if it were only for this, that thro' that Channel, tho' impure, we our selves received our Orders, and to it my Lord of *Sarum*, in some measure, tho' at a great distance, owes his own.

His Lordship says, Wharton made an earnest Application to him, to secure for him at Archbishop Tillotson's Hands, a Prebend of Canterbury, when vacant. that he pressed the Archbishop as much as it was decent for him to do, but could not obtain a Promise; whereupon Wharton thought he was neglected, looked on it as a civil denial, and said, He would be reveng'd; and so he publish'd that Specimen. This is a heavy Charge indeed, but where is the Proof, and, you know, we will take nothing in such a Case without a Voucher? *These Tales end in dead Men.* Wharton is dead, and so is Archbishop Tillotson, and here are no Vouchers for this Application, and threats of Revenge. He talks of neither in his Letter to the Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield, when both Tillotson and Wharton were alive, in vindication of himself from the Specimen; neither can I learn that it hath been in any of his Papers these twenty Years past; and if his Lordship could have prov'd it beyond an *ipse dixit*, I fancy, he would have acquainted the World quickly with it, (and let Mr. Wharton and his Friends have deny'd it if they dar'd) both to oppose the Adversary, who, he says, has

wrote

wrote against him both with so much Malice and such Contempt, and for his own necessary and just Defence. But p. 23. his Lordship positively affirms, Tillotson justified his pressing him to take Wharton under his particular Protection so fully, that he sent and asked his Lordship's Pardon : He said, He was set on to do it, and that if he would procure any thing for him, he would discover every thing to him. This is to the Purpose indeed, when proved, for it would shew Mr. Wharton to be a very ill Man, and the Bishop to be scurvily abused for his designed Kindness to him; but what Proof of all this? This is still only *Teste me ipso apud Sarum*. I believe, if all this could have been proved, as easily as said, it would have been made as publick as Dr. A——'s Recantation, or Chivers's Defamation : And I can scarce imagine his Lordship to have been so self-denying, as to lose an Opportunity of knowing the Depth of that Secret History, to the utter Confusion of his Enemies, and the Vindication of himself, of promoting this Specimen against his celebrated Work, had there been such a Contrivance, for want of a farther gracious look or promise; which he was then in a Capacity easily

to perform. Supposing all this were true, which will not quickly be believed without good Authority by those, who knew both Mr. *Wharton* and the Bishop, yet still it must be left to a Jury, before it gain legal and external Credit, some Facts in History recited by his Lordship being found, as I have shewed even in this Defensative, the *Introduction*, in relation to Dr. *Hickes* and Mr. *Lesley*, to be notorious Errors and Mistakes. Thus much for Mr. *Wharton*. Better Pens, I hope, will either justifie him, or his Lordship. P. 27. His Lordship comes now to give an Account of the Reasons, that mov'd him to set about this Work at this time. *The reasons of my engaging in it at first seemed now to return upon me; and have determined me to delay the doing of it no longer. The danger of a Popish Successor then in view, and the dreadful Apprehensions we had of the Power of France, and of the Zeal with which the extirpating that which some call'd the pestilent Heresy that had so long infested these Northern Kingdoms, was then driven on, made it seem a proper Time to awaken the Nation, by shewing both what Popery, and what the Reformation was; by shewing the Cruelty and Falshood*

of the former, and what the Patience and Courage of our Reformers was; and the Work had generally so good effect then, that if the like dangers seem to revert, it may not be an improper Attempt, to try once more to awaken the Nation, that has perhaps forgot past dangers, and yet may be nearer than ever. Than ever? What? than when either the Duke of York was presumptive Heir to the Crown, or was Possess'd of it? The true English of it is this. I publish'd the two first Volumes on the View of the Duke of York's coming to the Crown, (and the sooner because of the sitting of the true Protestant Oxford Parliament, see *Letter to the Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield*, p. 11.) and of what he would do in favour of Popery, when he came to it, which had good effect on the Nation; and this induces me to attempt the same again by the same Method, now we have such another Successor in View. Had not some other Speeches and Practices of his Lordship and others been more moving than his *History of the Reformation*, we should probably have been under the Government of popish King James to his dying Day; and I dare engage such are more likely to keep out a

popish Successor still, than a third Volume of the *History of the Reformation*, tho' never so correct and exact. For my part I am under no apprehensions from a popish Successor, (tho' I would not willingly have such an one, when I can fairly help it) for if he hath but common Sense, King *James's* Misfortunes will teach him more Prudence; and I cannot but perswade my self, that if he should follow his Steps here, he would quickly take his Travels elsewhere. For let us talk never so much in Theory, for *Passive Obedience* and *Non Resistance*, we should practically Abdicate him the same way, if he should do the same things. We are not now more heartily and conscientiously Zealous for *Passive Obedience* than we were then. Tho' the late Revolution may teach us not to part with a Lawful Prince for small Matters, because the invaluable Blessing was purchased at an extravagant Price of Blood and Money, yet may it also teach a Prince to be cautious in his Government, lest he should lose it, and put himself and his People to great Inconveniencies. This Suggestion of the danger of another popish Successor in view, when we have so many Acts of Parliament against such

an one, and of the formidable Power of France, (which is at least Sedition, if it be Sedition to raise unnecessary Fears and Jealousies all over a Nation) doth not very well become his Pen, who professeth it unlawful to resist, (much less then to revile and raise popular Odiums on Government,) for any Cause less than a Chimerical total Subversion. We had none of these Fears and Jealousies instilled three or four Years ago, and then Popery advanced as much as it doth now, and we were taught not to say a word of it: nor to keep our People from publick Mass, for fear of disobliging our new popish Allies; but then Whig reigned; and there was no occasion for those two terrible words, Popery and Persecution; but now they are under Hatches, they are coming in with a mighty Torrent, because we have made an useful (I had almost said a necessary) Peace with a popish Enemy. 'Tis a sign of Popery to make Peace with a popish Enemy for Advantage, but of the Security of the Protestant Religion to serve popish Allies at a consuming and astonishing Expence. I abominate the cowardly and unmanly Cruelties of the Church of Rome, as much as any Man, and no People with Innocence, can too

fe.

securely guard against them. I think the Cruelty of Queen's *Mary's* Reign cannot be set out in too lively Colours, consistently with Truth; the Persecution was barbarous and inhumane; neither can the Patience and Courage of our Reformers be too highly commended: but the Courage of our Reformers was a Passive, not an Active one, which the Bishop recommends in his Prefaces and Introductions; *so that his Lordship had best take care not to applaud their passive Valour, lest he should thereby condemn some Opinions and Practices of his own. Either let him put into his Errata these glorious Characters of Patience and meek Courage, with which he hath justly adorned his reforming Heroes, or else the History and the Preface will not stand well together. The Bishop talks of Deliverances another way, p. 68. but his Heroes thought of no other than by Patience and Submission. They were made perfect through Sufferings, but our Deliverances and Perfections must be accomplished, not by our own, but by the Blood of others.*

But continues his Lordship on the same Argument, p. 28. " If there is any
 " Difference between the present State
 " of Things, and that we were in above
 " thir-

“ thirty Years ago, it is that we are
 “ now more naked and defenceless,
 “ more insensible and stupid, and much
 “ more depraved in all respects than we
 “ were then. ” Alas ! any Age of the
 glorious Revolution worse than the latter
 Days of King *Charles II.* and that a
 Whig should say this ! *We are sunk in*
our Learning, vitiated in Principle, (I
 wish his Lordship would give us an a-
 dequate definition of Principle, that we
 may know where abouts we are) *tainted,*
some with Atheism, others with Superstition,
&c. Poor Dr. *Sacheverell* ! his Fate
 was hard, to be impeached and condem-
 ned for saying the Church was in dan-
 ger, and even condemned for it by this
 good Bishop too, who now tells us the
 very same thing, unless a Church can be
 safe and flourishing, when the generality
 of the People are stupid and insensible,
 and more depraved than ever ; *Sunk in*
Learning, vitiated in Principle, (if a Man
 knew what it was) *and tainted with A-*
theism and Superstition, &c. Is not this a
 thorow Vindication of Dr. *Sacheverell* ?
 for did he say other things than these ?
 unless all this Degeneracy and Corrup-
 tion have sprung up within three or four
 Years, which I deny, and will be bold
 to

to maintain, that not one corrupt Principle or Practice reigns now, but what did then at least in as great, if not an higher degree ; even at the same time his Lordship and some other of his Brethren Voted and Addressed the Church out of all Danger, and in a flourishing Condition ? I hope we are somewhat mended ; I am sure we are not worse, for I have not heard of late of Dedications of Blasphemous Treatises against the Holy Trinity to prime Ministers of State ; passed, as far as I can learn, if not with Countenance, yet with Impunity, by those very Ministers when regnant. Suppose any one should inscribe a devout Tract of Atheism to a Christian Prince or Ministry, would they bear it ? And yet those Ministers did, at least tamely bear one against the Christian Deity : An Instance not to be parallell'd, I believe, in any other Christian Kingdom. I have more Charity, than to suppose the States of *Holland* would bear such a Dedication. What his Lordship says here of Moral Corruption, is, God knows, too true ; but I cannot allow it of the Intellectual. I cannot think we are sunk in Learning. We are much worse indeed in Principle and Morals than

than in the latter End of the Reign of King *Charles* the Second, when the popish Successor was in view, and even during that Popish Successor's Reign, for Persecution harms not the Church, but cleanses and purifies her. And I will be bold to say, the Church of *England* never more truly flourish'd in any four Years since the Reformation, than in those of that Prince; for then People seem'd to be in earnest, but (still with respect to it) reasons have come in with the Revolution for this universal Pravity. I will name but two, The supine Relaxation of Ecclesiastical Discipline, and the little or no regard had even to the Laws of the Toleration. Toleration oftentimes, even under good limitations, gives great licence to the Age, but when it hath few Restraints, and those not duly executed, the World will be deplorably remarkable for all manner of viciousness in Principle and Practice. His Lordship concludes this Paragraph with an high Compliment to himself, about the *Ad-*
der and the *Charmer*. If there are no wiser Charms, than what his Lordship hath obliged the World with in some late (quarterly, I think,) Prefatory Discourses, with submission, I believe it
would

would not soon grow either wiser or better for him. " All Books relating to those Controversies lie dead in Shops, few calling for them. " His Lordship is mistaken here, for, not to mention Dr. *Hickes's Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, &c.* and his *Controversal Letters*, and Mr. *Spinckes's Answer to the Essay, for Catholick Communion*, a late Book, viz. *The Case stated between the Church of Rome and the Church of England*, hath been called for so fast, that in a little time it hath passed a fourth Impression, and several Thousands of them have been sold; and, which is more, no Book wrote against Popery for several Years past hath made such a Noise, and more raised the visible Displeasure (a sure Sign it touch'd their Cause to the Quick) of the *English Romanists*. But perhaps for the sake of the Author, who hath laid great Obligations on his Lordship, and some of his performances, especially if he should give his Lordship a new Irritation, being eternally good at distinctions (as sure as Resistance from the establish'd Doctrines of the Church of England) he may find in, and prove rank Popery from that Treatise. If he should speak well of it now, so he did formerly of absolute

lute and unconditional Non-resistance, yet cannot now find any such thing in Nature, Law, Gospel, or History. I am certain he may find Popery there, if he would but give his mind to it, as well as in the Regale and Pontificate, or in the Project of Union between the Anglican and Gallican Churches, by bringing the last up to the Reformation of the first: For both Books urge a Reformation in the Church of Rome, and a Coalition only on truly Catholick and Apostolick Terms.

P. 24, 35, 36. His Lordship finds an Article agreed to in the Earl of *Sussex* his Register, which he fancies would easily introduce the Inquisition, and that it served preparatory to it. The Summ of it is, that secret Spies were appointed to inform against their Neighbours, without being known who they were, for certain Crimes and Transgressions, for which they were punished. I must confess, I do not approve of punishing any Man, unless he who is accused, have the Accuser Face to Face, and have Liberty to answer for himself, concerning the Crime laid against him, *Acts 25. v. 16. more Romano veteri, non novo*: But what were the Crimes they were thus punished for? were

were they not those of ill Behaviour; Sedition, and Immorality? and it would be well for most Governments, if some honest *Delators* were Encouraged, not to trepan, but fairly and openly to accuse incorrigibly seditious Persons, that they might be punished and the Nation quiet: Such an Inquisition would be reasonable and necessary, but it would spoil many a good Preface and Introduction.

“ Here is that (*saieth his Lordship*)
 “ which those, who look towards a
 “ Popish Successor must look for, when
 “ that evil Day comes.” But how can
 that evil Day of a Popish Successor
 come? All foreign Papists related to
 the Crown are cut off from Inheritance
 by the Protestant Act; and him whom
 the Bishop hath always in his View,
 and who haunts him like a Ghost,

Cujus saepe animo turbata recurset imago.

he sometimes calls an Impostor; and I
 am fully perswaded, this Nation would
 never indure an Impostor on the Throne,
 much less a Popish one, were there no
 excluding Act: So that I cannot see,
 why his Lordship makes all this bustle,

but

but that you may be sure not to believe him, when he says the Pretender is an Impostor.

“ *Ibid.* The Reviving the Fires in *Smithfield*, and from thence over the whole Nation, has no amiable View, to make any haste to it.” A Body would think they were just Lighted by his Lordship’s excessive Fears. His Head runs so much on Fire and Faggot in Prefaces and Introductions, as if he thought there was no other way of dying but that; that a Man could not die out of his Bed, but presently it must be in *Smithfield*: whereas if the Nation were but thoroughly furnish’d with that *Panoplia*, that Set of Distinctions which a certain Prelate declared to a certain betray’d Prince, he had, to evade the Doctrine of absolute Non-Resistance, when it should pinch, no Inquisition or *Smithfield* Fires can touch them; they are a political Insurance against Fire, and you may as well catch a Spirit and burn it, as such a nimble and volatile Distinguisher.

P. 37. *Then they*, meaning the *British* fugitive Confessors, *when the evil day of a persecuting Popish Successor shall come, may expect to meet with some of that haughty Contempt, with which too many have treat-*

ted Forreigners, who took Sanctuary among
 us. This doth not seem so well to agree
 with his Lordship's Character of us in
 his first Fast Sermon before King *William*
 and Queen *Mary*, printed but this very
 Year ; where, p. 40. he thus saith of
 us, in relation to this very thing, " We
 " have been hitherto, the Refuge and
 " Sanctuary of all, that being persecu-
 " ted elsewhere, have fled hither for
 " shelter ; and I hope, the Charity
 " shewed to our Brethren, that came
 " from *France*, and that which is now
 " shewed to those who fly hither from
 " *Ireland*, have got us a great many
 " Prayers of our side." But then was
 then, and now is now. But perhaps
 his Lordship means the honest conscien-
 tious *Palatines*, Men of all Religions and
 of none, the Refuge of *Germany*, and the
 Scum and Dregs of human Nature be-
 tween that Country and this. I wish
 his Lordship would give us the true
 Reason of their solemn Invitation hi-
 ther, and tell us what they deserved
 when they were here. But if he means
 the *French Hugonots*, several of them car-
 ry a splendid Appearance, both Cleri-
 cal and Laical, whilst Natives are neg-
 lected. Let his Lordship shew any Peo-
 ple

ple that have used them more civilly, than the *English*, (if occasion should be, may they find the same, and they do not desire a better treatment,) especially those of the Church and Court, to whom they have proved most ingrateful, always siding with the Schismatical and Factious, and using their utmost Power at every Opportunity against the Church and Crown in favour of Dissenters from both. Some jealous Governments for their own Safety would have sent them on a second Peregrination. They have grown rich and insolent upon our Alms and Assistances; they might have starv'd for those People they Court: nay, a Popish Prince, who was a great Benefactor to them in his Prosperity, was extolled to the Skies by a dignify'd *French* Hugonot, (whom his Lordship very well knows to have been amply provided for here) as long as he was giving and encouraging; but when Misfortunes fell on him, the same Person joyned in the common Crucifiges against him. In a word, unless they had behaved themselves all along more gratefully and respectfully to Church and State, their Supplies were vastly Superior to their Deserts, and their Deserts,

in relation to this Nation, of the lowest Kind. May there be a return of Gratitude in them, and then all will be forgot. No true Church, nor Crown retain Whiggish resentments, or think any Transgression against them irremissible, and Sins against the Holy Ghost. May they improve the Opportunity. You see, Sir, how his Lordship spoils every thing he undertakes in the Whig Cause, it looks as if he were retained on the Tory side.

If nothing else will affect this stupid Nation, his Lordship hopes to affrighten them with the View of the Resumption of the impropriated Tithes and Church-Lands, saying, *p.* 38. &c. “ The Resumption of these would be no easie
 “ Matter to many Families; and yet all
 “ these must be thrown up; for Sacrilege
 “ in the Church of *Rome* is a mortal Sin,
 “ and therefore Cardinal *Poole*, even in
 “ that pretended Confirmation of the
 “ Grants that were then made, laid a
 “ heavy Charge on those, who had the
 “ Goods of the Church in their Hands, to
 “ remember the Judgments of God that
 “ fell on *Belshazzar*, for profaning the holy
 “ Vessels, tho’ they had not been taken
 “ by himself, but by his Father, &c.”

And

And is not Sacrilege a mortal Sin in the Church of *England*, as well as in the Church of *Rome*? If not, the Church of *Rome* in that Case is more Reformed than the Church of *England*. *Thou that abhorrest Idols, dost thou commit (or justify) Sacrilege?* Few Divines in point of Conscience and Equity, whatever they may do in point of Law, will ever justify the prophane Alienation of Lands and Goods devoted to sacred Uses, by reason of the abuse of them to Superstition, but will rather desire their Continuance with a Conversion to proper and pious Uses. And since the Reformation, several Impropiators, without regard had to the heavy Charge of Sacrilege, as laid by Cardinal *Poole*, have restor'd Tithes, &c. to the Church, because they thought they could not keep them with safe Consciences, tho' the Matter was not so easy to the Circumstances of some of their Families. But where is the Occasion for this Fear? If the Resumption could not be effected in Queen *Mary's* Days, probably they will never be legally restored to the Church in any of her Successors. Popery will find it a much harder Game to play now than then. Even that *Set of Men*, which his

C 3

Lordship

Lordship, p. 37. calls *so impiously corrupted in the Point of Religion*, will hinder such a Resumption, which can never be effected but in a devout, considerate, and penitent Age. Every Thing, that Popery was formerly possessed of here, would sooner return than the alienated Revenues of the Church: Even Papists themselves must be much more reformed than they are, before such a Thing can be expected; the more loose and licentious you find Men, the less you will observe them disposed to Restitution. This seems to be one of his Lordship's last Efforts against the Fears of approaching Popery. Argument runs low; the Stock is almost exhausted, and his Lordship run quite out of Breath.

P. 39. His Lordship is displeased, that the Clergy were engaged (a Thing then entirely in their own Power,) to renew no Leases, because thereby their Revenues would be in time greatly encreased. I would willingly see a good Reason given, why a Clergy-man may not as honestly make the best of his Ecclesiastical, as a Layman of his Temporal Estate; especially if he doth it with an intent to be the more hospitable and charitable therewith. What shall be called

called Prudence and Foresight in the one, by an unjust and partial World shall be termed Covetousness and Worldly-mindedness in the other. I dare say, no Clergy in the World, taking the whole Body together, spend more Moneys in their Education, (nay, some spend as much as would purchase the Fee of their temporary Preferments,) and are a less Charge to the Laity, than the Clergy of the Church of *England*. And then why all this Noise, if they could have legally advantaged themselves and their Successors by not renewing of Leases? *Justinian* and *Galen* may frequently leave great Honours and Revenues to a worthless Posterity, without Envy or an ill Word; but the Tribe of *Levi* must have little or no Inheritance; and even in these Ages of thorough Reformation, they are perfect Muck-worms, if they can do more for their Children, than just keep them from being Heirs in Reversion to the circulating Charity of the Sons of the Clergy.

Ibid. His Lordship says, " All that
 " Transaction, meaning the papal Con-
 " firmation of the Alienation of Church-
 " Lands, was fraudulent, and had so
 " many Nullities in it, that it may be
 " broke

“ broke through, whensoever there is
 “ a Power strong enough to set about
 “ it. No doubt of it. It can be done,
 when it can be done. But where is the
 probability of a Power big enough to
 break thro’ it? We must see the World
 less in love with it self, than there is
 reason to hope for from the present
 Face of Affairs, before a Man in his
 right Wits can entertain such a Notion.
 If there be no greater Danger of Pope-
 ry, than of the Resumption of Ecclesia-
 stical Lands, it is at the greatest distance
 imaginable; and his Lordship may bawl
 his Heart out, before he will gain the
 least Credit to his prophetical Harangues:
 But this serves to make a Noise.

P. 46. His Lordship, upon the Con-
 clusion of this Head, “ cannot but take
 “ notice of one Insinuation, that he
 “ hears some are not ashamed to make:
 “ That such a Resumption may be in-
 “ deed a Prejudice to the Laity, but
 “ that the Clergy will be enriched by
 “ it. If this had been brought me, *saieth*
his Lordship, “ by an ordinary Hand, I
 “ should not have thought it worth
 “ mentioning; but since some have the
 “ Impudence to set it on foot, (no
 “ doubt, on certain Prospects of Re-
 “ sumptions)

“sumptions.) I must add, that these
 “are vain Hopes, as well as they are
 “suggested on black Designs: For tho’
 “the Church, take it in the Bulk, has
 “immense Riches in the *Roman Com-*
 “munion; yet in no Church that ever
 “I saw, are the Parochial Clergy kept
 “poorer, and made more despicable,
 &c. I must confess, The Appropriati-
 ons of what originally belonged to the
 Secular, to the sole Use of the Regular
 Clergy in the Church of *Rome*, are
 highly scandalous and provoking; yet
 (if I might not anger his Lordship, nor
 be thought to vilify our Reformation
 and Reformers, *p. 70.*) I should be apt
 to ask, Have we not still some of those
 Remains of Popery, even in our own
 Reformed Church? Doth not the See of
Sarum (I am sure others do) neither
 actually possess, nor lease out, any ap-
 propriate Tithes, to the great Prejudice
 of the poor Incumbent, without black
 and Hellish Designs? The Reigns of
K. Edward and Queen *Elizabeth* brought
 us the Reformation in earnest, for which
 their Memories will be blessed; yet the
 most exorbitant Alienations of some Ec-
 clestiaſtical Revenues in their Times, will
 add no Embellishments to them, or
 elevate

elevate their Characters. *Tollatur abusus, continuetur usus.* And, if it be blameable in the Church (as no doubt but it is) to divert those Revenues from pious and charitable Uses to superstitious Magnificence and Luxury, whereby the Will of the Donors is frustrated; and therefore that they ought to revert into Lay Fees; how do the Secular Impropriators better answer the Designs of the Resumption, which were Charity and Hospitality, when a great many of those Estates (a Canker generally attends them) administer for a Time either to sordid Covetousness at home, or Extravagancy and Effeminacy abroad, without any Good or Advantage to, Lustre or Decorum amongst their Neighbours? It would be no black Design to return the impropriated Revenues (with Reformation) for a reasonable Price to the Church; and even in the unreformed Countries, I believe, there are used much more Hospitality and Charity out of the appropriated Estates, by the Clergy, than those of the Laity, so that the Design would not be quite so black and Hellish, as his Lordship fancies. I cannot think it would be worse, even to cheat a poor deluded

deluded People into a wrong and superstitious way by the Liberality and Charity of the Church, than out of the same Revenues for Great Men to furnish out vain and pompous Retinues for themselves and their Women, whilst the Poor are starved, Tenants are racked, Servants at Board-Wages, and Wives (like disbanded Officers) at half Pay. Splendid Appearances, and empty Performances! Both are wrong, but there is as much Difference between the one and the other, as between Superstition and Profaness. The Queen hath returned the First-Fruits and Tenths to the Church; may such a laudable Example be followed under due Regulations: They are better where they are placed, than in the Hands of Courtiers and Courtisans.

P. 47. His Lordship is running out into severe Exclamations against those, who, he imagins, are just delivering of us up unto Popery. And I cannot conceive, whom he should mean here by those, except the Parliamentary Nobility and Gentry, seeing it is not in the Power of the Ministry alone. These, says his Lordship, " Are easily hired to
" betray their Religion, to sell their
" Country,

“ Country, (not to the *Dutch*, I hope,)
 “ and to give up that Liberty and those
 “ Properties, which are the present Fe-
 “ licities and Glories of this Nation. ”

If so, here is a great Scandal on the Parliament, as if they were going to introduce Popery; for otherwise it is humanely and morally impossible it should prevail here to the Loss of our Religious and Civil Liberties. This is a Scandal with a Vengeance, (Neck or Nothing,) yet I defie his Lordship to give one Instance, at present, of the Government's or Nation's Inclination to Popery, more than they were when Bully *Whigg* was Trump, and rode *Flying Post*. *But none of these things, saith his Lordship, will move an insensible and degenerate Race, who are thinking of nothing but present Advantages. This doth not hang well together, for it is scarce credible that they, who would betray their Religion. sell their Country, and give up their Liberties and Properties, to support a luxurious and brutal Course of irregular and voluptuous Practices, would be for Popery, if they thought the Abby-Lands would go off with their old Religion. No, such would be the most strenuous Advocates against the Return of Popery, if they thought they should*

lose

lose any thing by it. *The giving up* (meaning Religion, Country, Liberty and Property) *will be a lasting Infamy on those who are guilty of it, and will draw after it the heaviest Curses of Posterity on such perfidious Betrayers of their Trust.* Undoubtedly. This is a Blow sure at the House of Commons: But those are a certain Curse to the present Generation, who indefatigably labour to instil endless Fears and Jealousies, and which, if not prevented in due Time, may entail Curses, as bad as *Popish* ones, on late Posterity.

P. 48. *I saw a great and fair Prospect of such a Change* (discouraging of a Century or two past) *ready to be made in France, as King Henry had made in England.* Did he observe it of that time, and could not he observe the same in the Conclusion of the last Century, and who it was, that in a great measure hindered it? A Protestant Friend of his Lordship's, who, for the Preservation and Extension of the Protestant Name, took, in Alliance, an Oath against such a Change, and made the Court of *France* desist from such Reforming Pretensions: The compleatest Victory obtained by that Prince against the exorbitant

Lewis

Lewis XIV. Mr. *Lesley's* Union with the *Gallican* Church on Reformed Principles, (for it was no other, and his Lordship knows it was no other) was indeed an impudent Proposal; and now you may guess, Sir, at the Reason why his Lordship is so angry with it. The Conversion of King *Augustus* was the Consequence of such Measures. Call these things the real or pretended Security of *Europe*, if you please, but not of the Protestant Religion, lest the World should not know when we bold *Britons* spoke in jest or earnest.

P. 51. Yet now, saith his Lordship, I have examined all that I could find of these matters, I confess, I am not inclined to expect much from the Assemblies of Clergy-men. I have seen nothing in Church History (so either his Lordship's Ecclesiastical Reading is very small or partial, or the Clergy have been uninterruptedly the vilest Body of Men upon Earth; this seems to be taken out of a secret History) to incline me to depart from Gregory Nazianzen's Opinion of those Assemblies: What has happened among our selves of late, has not made me of another Mind. I have touched upon this before incidentally, but now in course give me leave to give another

another Reason, why his Lordship may be displeased with modern Convocations. Perhaps they were for Censuring some of this Author's Performances; some Expositions perhaps formed in Opposition to the Letter or unavoidable Sense of the Original Texts; and that would make any body out of love with them. Indeed some Transactions in a prevailing part of one House of Convocation, in relation to such things, *would incline some People not to expect much from the Assemblies of such Clergymen.* They should have made the Bishop either justify himself from such an enormous Charge, or have given the other House full Leave and Opportunity to have maintain'd their Accusation against him; but the Denial of intermediate Sessions, and sudden and unexpected Prorogations, are as useful to some People's Writings, as *Scandalum Magnatum* is to their Reputations. Shall I give you, Sir! a Table of Forfeitures for Civil and Religious Blasphemy? If you blaspheme a P——, (tho' he should be a Disgrace to his Ancestors, and has not much more Money or Honour, than he carries in his Pocket and Coronet) a Verdict of 10000 l. if the Queen, but 30 or 40 Marks

Marks at most; if God Almighty, nothing to pay. As for *Gregory Nazianzen's* Opinion, (to make him consistent with himself, for he certainly had a good Opinion of the first Council of *Nice*, which was a general one, and he was against the *Arians*, and therefore did not think ill of all Assemblies of Clergymen) it was specially spoken with respect to the Council of *Constantinople*, where he had been ill treated. It was an intemperate Speech from a Man in Sickness, chagrin and discontent. This is an Expression supplemental to the *Rights of the Christian Church*. They both quote *Gregory's* hasty (but unsupported) Opinion of the Assemblies of Clergymen, and both for the same laudable Ends: To disgrace the Clergy.

P. 53, 54. Speaking of the Concorde between the Pope and the French King about dividing the Spoils of the *Gallican Church*, he saith, *In it this Nation will see what it is to deliver up the essential Liberties of a free Constitution to a Court, and to trust to the Integrity and Firmness of Courts of Justice, when an Assembly of the States is no more necessary to the raising of Money, and the Support of the Government. In it this Nation will*
see,

fee, &c. Surely his Lordship here is for resuming the proper Rights of the Clergy of taxing themselves in Convocation for their Spiritual Estates. Had an High-Church-Man made such an *inuendo*, he would have been accused of Breach of Privilege of Parliament, if not of invading the Supremacy, which are always sacred; but some People think fit to invade both, as Turns and Turns are to be served thereby.

Ibid. & p. 55. His Lordship quotes an Expression of Bishop Godeau, with Commendation, in relation to the Misery of the Gallican Church, saying, *Our Fathers have groaned, and all that love the Order of the House of God will still groan, as long as Elections continue to be put down; so that we must needs enter into the Sanctuary by the way of the Court.* In another place, *These Promotions have been always fatal to the Church, and the Bishops that the Court has made, have been ordinarily the chief Advancers of Schisms, Heresies, and of the Oppression of the Church.* And a little below his Lordship cites a Passage in a Greek Writer, *Princes choose such Men to that Charge who may be their Slaves, and in all things obsequious to what they prescribe, and may lie at their Feet, and have*

*not so much as a Thought contrary to their
 Commands. Alas ! Poor Court-Bishops !*
 How feelingly and sensibly his Lordship
 speaks, as if it had been lately the Na-
 tion's Case ! I believe that several dig-
 nified with the Lawn within less than
 Thirty Years last past, must have been
 contented with coarser Cloth, had they
 not been promoted by, and before-hand
 shew'd a fair Countenance of complying
 with a certain Court in every thing.
 Sacerdotal Election would not have put
 the Mitres on their Heads. This is ad-
 mirably well observed by the Bishop, and
 justly commended : A *Whigg* may say
 any thing, backwards and forwards, and
 it is still the same ; but had a wicked
Tory said this, it had been another Refle-
 ction or Attacque on the Supremacy and
 the Crown. *Plowden's Case*. He would
 have been told, how ungrateful it had
 been to have eat the King's Bread, and
 voted against him. I wish to God, all
 Nominations and Elections to Ecclesi-
 astical Offices and Preferments, were
 now, as they were originally, independ-
 ently in Church-Hands ; and then if
 the Clergy failed in their Duty to the
 Church or the Sovereign, in God's Name,
 let the Secular Arm use it's Authority
 and

and chastise them; but let every thing run in its own proper Chanel. Render unto *Cæsar* the things that are *Cæsar's*, and unto *God* the things that are *God's*. I fear not the Imputation of Popery for this; it is as far from it as the East from the West. The two Extremes in this Case, are Popery and Erastianism: *Rome* and *Holland*.

Ibid. & p. 56. *This Change in their Constitution has put an end not only to National, but even to Provincial Synods in that Kingdom.* This his Lordship wisely blames as the effect of *Erastian* Principles. May it be consider'd by all Christian Princes, States and Churches. But what will the World think and say of those Synods, which, tho' they act under Restrictions from the Crown, will not use that Liberty, which the Crown not only gives, but encourages them to use, in order, in some measure, to suppress the rampant Blasphemy, Licentiousness and Hypocrisy of a most dissolute Age? If the Crown hath tied them up too much by Prerogative and Parliament, why do they not use at least that Power they have, and are invited to use? This is wilful, and their own Fault. " This is
 " a way indeed to put an end not only

“ to National, but even to Provincial
 “ Synods in this Kingdom; ” of which
 his Lordship complains so much in
France: For to what purpose should
 more than an Hundred Clergymen, at
 a great Expence, meet at most but twice
 a Week to say Prayers together, and
 afterwards Grace, and so back again to
 their Lodgings, with great Content to
 themselves, and wonderful Service to
 the Church?

Ibid. *The Assemblies of the Clergy meet
 only to give Subsidies, &c.* And yet p. 53,
 54. speaking of the *Gallican Church*, as
 a Warning to other Churches, not to
 split on the same Rock, his Lordship
 saith, *In it this Nation will see what it is
 to deliver up the essential Liberties of a
 free Constitution to a Court, and to trust to
 the Integrity and Firmness of Courts of Ju-
 stice, when an Assembly of the States* (Ec-
 clestialtical he must mean, or else it is
 not to the Purpose) *is no more necessary
 to the raising of Money, and the Support of
 the Government.* In one place a French
 Synod is necessary to raise Subsidies, in
 the other not. How shall we reconcile
 this? Is there not occasion here for some
 of his Lordship's new invented Distin-
 ctions, to reconcile *eodem tempore* Affir-
 mations

mations and Negations: No Subsidies; Subsidies; Non-resistance, Resistance?

Ibid. And tho' in the Year 1682, they drew up some Articles, yet those had their Authority only from the Severity of the King's Edict, till by a Transaction with the Court of Rome, that was let fall. Let him speak out, he can do it, and tell us what Transaction that was, what were the Motives to it, and who were the principal Movers. Those Articles had all the Authority the Church and State could give them; and probably they might have continued and increased to this Day, had not Necessity of Affairs, and too much human Policy, obliged that Nation to rescind them, on the Threatning of a good Potentate and his Allies, yet swore they would never be for Peace till it was done. Let his Lordship explain otherwise that Transaction with the Court of Rome, and the Occasion of it, if he pleases.

P. 61. After a short and handsome Declamation on Religion in general, on the Christian in particular, and more especially on the Reformed part of it, his Lordship begins to renew our Fears and Jealousies of Popery, saying, *It is not enough for such as understand this mat-*

ter, to be contented in their own Thoughts, with this, that they resolve not to turn Papists themselves: They ought to awaken all about them, even the most ignorant and the most stupid, to apprehend their Danger, and to exert themselves with their utmost Industry to guard against it and resist it. They ought to use all their Efforts (that is, something more than Prayers and Tears) to prevent it, and earnestly to pray to God for his Blessing upon them. This is, *Make a noise Tom*, and would not a Man think by this direful Exclamation, that the Bill for restoring the Pope's Supremacy had at least been read, and twice passed in the House of Commons? But after all, if there be no Danger of Popery, at least not more than when his Lordship's Party had the Ascendant, when all things were in Safety, and it was next to Capital to say the Church was in danger; is it not at least Sedition to raise and foment such groundless Jealousies and Fears? Suppose the Mob should take the Cue, and rise into Rebellion upon it, and after all no such reason for it should appear (as I will suffer what somebody deserves if it doth) I would ask his Lordship, Whether God and Man would not lay the Iniquity of it to his Charge?

Few,

Few, very few else can see this imminent Danger of Popery returning in Triumph, besides his Lordship, and a few Subalterns to him, who pretend to the second Sight. When King *James* was openly endeavouring to introduce his own Religion as fast as he could, the Clergy Preach'd and Printed with Decency and Respect; but never Publish'd Preface upon Preface to animate all sorts of People to violent Resentments against the Crown; no, that was reserved for others, when a *total Subversion* (or something else) was in view. How do these Insinuations agree with his Lordship's late Notions of being purely Passive, till the Certainty of a *total Subversion*; a thing impossible to be known, as his too good Scholar *L. R.*, justly observed, till it was too late for a Remedy? If these Clamours are not a Trumpet to what I will not name, nothing is, but a Trumpet before an Army: And yet nothing less than a *total Subversion* is, or can be a justifiable Cause, in his Lordship's Opinion, of a legal Resistance? His late Prefaces call as loud for the People's Resentment, as any of the Age; and yet 'tis his Lordship's Doctrine, that Resistance is only lawful on a *total Subver-*

tion. Let him name one Act even of a partial *Subversion*, and it shall be his Apology. In his Vindication of himself from a Book entituled, *Some Discourses upon Dr. Burnet, and Dr. Tillotson, &c.* p. 57, 58. his Lordship owns, That the Cases of the Bishop of *London* and *Magdalen-College*, which were Acts open and avowed, and thought to have been very hard, would not justify a resistance. Hath the Government shewn any thing like that, or so much as done any thing to disoblige, but only discard an huckstering Generation, who, for fear we should be sold to the *French*, were just Sealing and Consigning of us over to the *Dutch*? But Popery is a Word for every thing we dislike. And yet now my hand is in at *total Subversion*, I will prove unto you, (which will seem very strange) that Dr. *Burnet* professed himself King *James's* faithful Subject and Servant, not only after he knew he had totally subverted the Government, and consequently had forfeited his Regal Power; but even then unconditionally (unless he had a saving Distinction in his Sleeve) unto his Live's end. You must know then, Sir! that in his Preface to his late Volume of Sermons, p. 5, 6. he says, *That the King's publick Declaration dispensing*
with

with the penal Laws, emitted April 1687, was an open and avowed Subversion of our Constitution; and p. 8. That the Declaration seemed to strike at all, and to alter our whole Constitution, upon which he justifies resisting of him: And when he might be resisted, certainly he had no Authority, unless Authority may lawfully be resisted. Now I will prove unto you, that after this plain Subversion, which justified Resistance, Dr. Burnet professed himself to be King James's faithful Subject. In his first Letter to my Lord Middleton, which was dated from the Hague, May 10, 1687, (O. S. I suppose, because his two following Letters were so dated) he saith, *I will never depart (no never) from the profoundest Respect to his Sacred Person, and Duty to his Government.* Now if King James had subverted the Government by his Declaration in April 1687, (as the Bishop said he did) and consequently lost all Regal Authority, what Respect was due to his sacred Person and Government, or what Authority had he in May following? Again, in his second Letter to the same Noble Lord of a later Date, May 17, 1687, O. S. he saith, *I will never forget that vast Duty that I owe to his Majesty.* And to crown all

all, he concludes his third Letter, bearing Date June 6, 1687, with these Words, *To the last moment of my Life I will pay all Duty and Fidelity to his Majesty.* Now how do Duty and Allegiance follow lost Sovereignty, and that unconditional to the Life's End? But I will pass by this, and shew you, that his Lordship hath discarded even *total Subversion*, and left it to shift for it self, (for he never continueth long in one Mind) and that he is not willing to stay for it, but to make the best use of his Time he can. *P. eâdem*, he saith, *Illegal Sufferings are no more to be born than the Violences of Robbers.* This must respect Personal and Particular Injuries from the Government, or those commissioned by it, or else it signifies nothing; for no Man questions, but a private Subject may forcibly and legally repell the sudden and violent Injuries of another. Indeed his Lordship saith, *ibid. & p. 62.* *But if the Law comes once to be in the Hands of those wicked Men, who will not only revive the repealed Laws against Hereticks, but, if they can, carry their Cruelty to the height of an Inquisition, then we must try by the Faith and Patience of the Saints to go through Fire and Water,* (I am to believe his Lordship would

would talk of a *total Subversion* in such a Case, if he dared, and had power enough to back it) *and in all things to be more than Conquerors*. But how will this agree with his Lordship's Notion of resisting K. *James*; for tho' that Prince had no Law for the High Commission-Court, and the Proceedings against *Magdalen-College*, both which were directly contrary to Law, yet he had the Law plainly on his side for absolute Non-Resistance in any Case, or on any Pretence whatsoever, which would have secured him from popular Prosecution, as much as if the High Commission-Court had been established by Law? But his Lordship is mistaken, King *James* abdicated, and so the Convention said, and, you know, Abdication all the World over is a voluntary Dereliction or Cession of Right. I have no better an Opinion of modern Popery (as, his Lordship says just below, some object to him) than of that which is more antient, whenever it shall have Power and Opportunity; but let us not scare our selves into Sedition and Rebellion for Fear of it, when we have no Reason, lest God should send that Judgment on us for such a groundless and pretended Fear. The Rebel-
Parliament

Parliament cut off King *Charles's* Head to prevent Popery, and that very Act and the Consequences of it brought our late Popery among us, which cost us so dear. *Venient Romani, venerunt Romani.*

P. 65. He calls *Odeschalchi's* a mild Reign. In the Postscript to this, Sir, I will give you the Reason why he speaks so well of that Pope: But as mild as it was, it was the occasion of one of the most destructive Wars that hath infested *Europe* for many Ages; and I think the most scandalous to the Papacy that hath been a good while. His Holiness had a Right to be spoken well of, because, however false he might be to the Principles of Religion, he was true and trusty to his Civil Interest. The Case in short was this: The Pope and the *French* King were at Difference not easily reconcilable; the *French* were powerful and resolute, and the Conjunction of the Forces both of *France* and *Spain* against him, whenever King *Charles II.* of *Spain*, should die, which was believed not to be far off, and touched him more sensibly, because the Dominions of that Crown in *Italy* lying nearer to him, this I say, made the Pope look nimbly about him, and engaged him to promote the
Grand

Grand Confederacy against the *French* King, tho' at the Expence of dethroning a Prince devoted to the Holy See. Religion gave way to Policy, God to Mammon; and tho' the E—— and the P—— of O—— were the visible Heads of that holy League, yet his Holiness was the Sanctified Operator of the whole. I hope to make the Bishop confess all this before I have done; *ex ore suo judicabitur*. His Lordship knows as well as any one, how the World went at that Time. He was not only at *Paris* in 1685, but not far from that Time at *Rome* too, when he received greater Civilities than could have been expected to be paid to one who had wrote the *History of the English Reformation*.

P. 67, 68, 69. He thunders out his conditional Anathema's against Peers, Commons and Clergy, if they do not run into his vehement Cry of Popery, and do not exert their utmost Force to prevent it. The Two first are threatened with Infamy, and the Curses of Posterity; the Third with Divine Vengeance for the Loss of Souls. *They are to guard against all Danger*, p. 67. *at what distance soever it may appear*. At this rate there will be no end of being upon the

the Guard; *at what distance soever Popery may appear*; tho' it should be a thousand Miles off; no nearer than *Rome* it self. I thought it had been just at hand by this strange and unaccountable Vociferation. I am sure the Laws against Popery, (without the extreme one in the Reign of King *William* of immortal Memory, of quitting Popery or Estate, which seems to 'entrench a little on the Principle his Lordship sometimes in a good Humour professeth to believe, of doing as we would be done unto) if put in Execution, are fully sufficient to keep out that Monster, tho' the Number of Papists in *England* were trebled; for it would be a Wonder to me, if Men who had no Arms, no Horse worth 5 *l.* and were confined within Five Miles of their own Dwellings, could subdue the Nation to their Power and Religion; all this would effectually do it without depriving them of their Estates, if they do not conform to any thing but Popery. The Parliament are threatned with a Re-Revolution, if they neglect this good Work, p. 68. *God may work a Deliverance for us another way, and if it seem good in his eyes, he will deliver us.* That is to say, Look to your selves, Gentlemen,

tlemen, if you do not do as we would
 have you, we have Power elsewhere to
 do it without you. This is Bullying the
 Parliament, as before the Queen and
 Ministry in his audacious Preface to the
Pastoral Care. But after all, where are
 these Instances of approaching Popery,
 which seem formidable? I can find none
 enumerated in all this clamorous Intro-
 duction, unless it be in Page 70, where
 some things are industriously misrep-
 resented, and some Doctrines called Popish,
 which are not so, but purely primitive;
 and amongst these some even formerly
 maintained with great Reason by this
 Author himself, tho' to promote his ex-
 pected Deliverance he now decries them.
 He cannot write a Book (scarce a Pre-
 face) consistently. To begin: *It is well
 known that in practice, the Necessity of Au-
 ricular Confession, and the Priestly Absolu-
 tion, with the Conceit of the Sacrifice of the
 Mass, are the most gainful parts of Popery,
 and are indeed those that do most effectually
 subdue the World to it.* Here it is insinu-
 ated, as if a great many Members yet
 remaining in the Church of England,
 were for the Necessity of Auricular Con-
 fession, Priestly Absolution, *quà* Popish,
 and for the Sacrifice of the Mass, as pra-
 ctised

etised in the Church of *Rome*, otherwise
 his Lordship's Argument is to no purpose.
 First as to Confession, I must own, when
 Men labour under great Doubts and
 Perplexities of Mind, or the Load of
 some grievous Sin or Sins, there are
 few Members of the Church of *England*,
 I believe, but who will think it expedi-
 ent and necessary to have Recourse to
 their Priest or Bishop for Solution, Sa-
 tisfaction, or particular Absolution, (be-
 sides the general one in the daily and
 ordinary Offices of the Church) which
 is expressly recommended in the invita-
 tory Exhortation to the Holy Commu-
 nion, (unless that Exhortation be po-
 pishly affected, and if his Lordship
 thinks so, he vilifies the Reformation
 and the Reformers, of which he accuses
 others in this Page, who suffered it to
 be there) and in the special Office for
 the Visitation of the Sick: And this is
 all that I know maintained by High
 Church-Men. The Church of *Rome* ex-
 pressly requires verbal Confession of all
 Sins, whereby they know the Secrets of
 the World, and manage thereby their
 Interests accordingly; but the Church
 of *England* requires no such thing, but
 only recommends particular Confession
 for

for the Direction and Comfort of Penitents under Doubts and Distress. Priestly Absolution indeed she enjoins as necessary, according to our Saviour's Commission of, *Whosoever Sins ye remit, &c.* but declares it hath due Effect only on the truly Penitent; as Baptism is an Ordinance of God initiatory into the Church of Christ, but the *opus operatum* will not save Unbelievers. By going into the Conceit of the Sacrifice of Mass; if his Lordship designs that Scandal shall fasten, he must mean the true Church-Man's Assertion of the Eucharistical Sacrifice. Now the Reformed Church of *England*. Men no more believe the Corporal Presence in the Commemorative Sacrifice of the Eucharist, than all the Legendary and pretended Miracles in the Church of *Rome*, or that Dr. *Barnet* is the Pope. The Doctrine of the proper Eucharistical Sacrifice is as different from that of Transubstantiation, as Spirit is from Flesh. This is an unfair Representation of us, by one who would be thought a Principle of Unity amongst us; but this groundless Insinuation is a Bone of Contention and Division thrown out. But, after all, suppose I prove his Lordship just such a Mass Priest (he is always a

E

good

good Witness at hand for me) as he would prove the High Church-Man, where are we then? I will do it. Read his Exposition on the 31st Article of our Church, of *the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross*. Speaking of this Oblation, his Lordship saith, *In two respects it may be also more strictly called a Sacrifice: One is, Because there is an Oblation of Bread and Wine made in it, which being Sanctified, are consumed in an Act of Religion. Another respect in which the Eucharist is called a Sacrifice, is, Because it is a Commemoration and a Representation to God of the Sacrifice that Christ offered for us upon the Cross.* And do not the Church and Highest Church-Men say just the same? When his Lordship wrote this, he did not know he should have occasion to retract or dispute it. And a little after, *Upon these Accounts we do not deny, but that the Eucharist may be well called a Sacrifice: But still it is a Commemorative Sacrifice, and not propitiatory: i. e. as the High Church-Men also say, (not as the Papists) Eucharistia est Sacrificium, non ex natura sua, sed vi institutionis tantummodo propitiatorium, in quantum commemorativum corporis Christi pro nobis verè oblatis, reddit Deum nobis propitiu-*

pitium

pitium. And now what Difference I pray you between the Expositor and the Masquerade? *Next*, saith his Lordship, *The Independence of the Church on the State, is also so contended for, as if it were on design to disgrace our Reformation.* If the Assertion of the Church's Independence disgraces our Reformation, his Lordship must come in for a Snack of the Guilt too; for he hath done the same in his Reflections on the Relation of the *English* Reformation, Printed in 1688. Consult his Third Chapter, entitled, *Some general Considerations on the Regal Supremacy, that was raised so high at the Reformation*; and there you will find these Expressions. Speaking of this Supremacy, he saith, "When our Author will undertake to justify all the Preambles of Bulls that are in the *Bullarium*, then we may undertake to justify all the Fourishes that may be in an Act of Parliament. When any Authority is asserted in general and indefinite Terms, these are always to be understood with those Restrictions and Limitations (arguing for the Spiritual Independence of the Church against Regal Supremacy) that the Nature of the things require to be sup-

“ posed, even when they are not ex-
 “ pressed. Again, It is a very unrea-
 “ sonable thing to urge some general
 “ Expressions, or some Stretches of the
 “ Royal Supremacy, and not to consider
 “ that more strict Explanation that was
 “ made of it, both in King *Henry VIII's*
 “ Time, and under Queen *Elizabeth*,
 (the High Church agrees to the Supre-
 macy, as explained in the Injunctions
 “ of the last Prince) that were so clear,
 “ that if we had to do with Men that
 “ had not resolved before-hand not to
 “ be satisfied, one would think there
 “ could not be room for farther Cavil-
 “ ling. After repeating the 37th Article
 of our Church, his Lordship says, “ This
 “ is all that Supremacy which we are
 “ bound *in Conscience* to own; and if
 “ the Letter of the Law, or the Stretches
 “ of that in the Administration of it,
 “ have carried this farther, we are not
 “ at all concerned in it. And again,
 “ If in the Time of our Reformation,
 “ some of our Bishops, (is not this a
 “ Blow at our Reformers?) or other
 “ Writers have carried the Royal Su-
 “ premacy too far, either in Acts of
 “ Convocation, or in their Writings, as
 “ those things are Personal Matters, in
 “ which

" which we are not at all concerned,
 " who do not pretend to assert an In-
 " fallibility in our Church; so their
 " Excess in this was a thing so natural,
 " that we have all possible Reason to
 " excuse it, or at least to censure it very
 " gently. What do you think of all
 this, Sir, and there is a great deal more
 to the same Purpose? Is not this Gen-
 tleman born to contradict himself? The
 Independence of the Church is as neces-
 sary for its Preservation in Times of Per-
 secution, as any Article of Faith, Do-
 ctrine, or Worship, for which it is per-
 secuted, is for its Integrity: *And that*
Bishop or Priest that dares to disown this,
is as much a real Judas to our Saviour, as
that nominal one who betrayed him. His
 Lordship knows as well as any body, the
 Difference between Popish and Reform-
 ed Independency. The Reformed Church
 asserts it only in Spirituals, entirely re-
 signing it self up, either actively or pas-
 sively, to the Will of the Supreme Ma-
 gistrate in Temporals; whereas the
 Church of *Rome* exempts its Clergy (*in*
ordine ad spiritualia) from the Secular
 Cognisance of the Civil Powers, with-
 out Leave first obtained from her. Now
 what possible Harm can come to the

State from an Independence professing absolute Non-Resistance; such an Independence is to secure the Rights of the Church in Times of Persecution, but never to molest or invade those of the State? Next his Lordship says, *The indispensable Necessity of the Priesthood to all sacred Functions is carried in the point of Baptism further than Popery.* His Lordship should have said, in Opposition to Popery, and then he had spoke right and proper. Here is a just Cause of retorting a Popish Principle, and Practice on his Lordship in the Case of Lay-Baptism, from which he will find it very difficult to extricate himself: Where the Truth lies in this Contest, you may easily find in some excellent Treatises lately published, and particularly, as his Lordship well knows, in Dr. Brett's *Letter to the Author of Lay Baptism invalid*; and what the Opinion of the Church of England is in the Point, is demonstratively legible in her Records and Monuments, to which I refer you for entire Satisfaction. Every true Church of England-Man must be against Lay-Baptism, if he believes and adheres to the Doctrine of his own Church. His Lordship says, *Their Devotions are openly recommended, and an*

Union with the Gallican Church has been impudently proposed. This I have fully spoke to in the beginning of this Letter, to which I refer you. I shall say no more of it here, but that it is an Insinuation so bold, and withal so notoriously false, (if his Lordship means the Devotions and Gallican Church, as Popish, and I defy him to mean any other) that I would advise his Lordship to omit it, when he publishes his Third Volume, lest such a Mistake in the Front, should cause the Reader to suspect the Veracity of the Author in the Body of the Book; and make him call to Mind and apply these pertinent Words of his Lordship in p. 28. of his Vindication, Men commonly chuse out the best of what they have to say, and put it in the Preface, which many will read, who will hardly give themselves the Trouble to go much further. A Preface that begins with so much Falshood is not very inviting. The Book and Preface are of a piece, and both are well suited to one another. And lastly, saith his Lordship, That Doctrine that has been most universally maintained by our best Writers, I mean the Supremacy of the Crown, is on many occasions arraigned. The Bishop hath already answered this Accusation himself, in the Words

quoted by me out of his *Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation*, in answer to a Popish Writer. Strange want of Memory or Modesty! If his Lordship and his Low Men would allow such a Supremacy in the Crown, as the High ones do, there would be no occasion for writing Prefaces, or resisting for Subversions. An High Church-Man cannot assert Church-Independency, but presently he is against the Regal Supremacy: A *Whig*, or Low Church-Man, never maintains it in Theory, but at that Time, and in Practice never; for he, whose Principle is to resist the Supreme Magistrate, when he thinks fit, is superior to that Magistrate, and has the Supremacy in himself: So Regal Supremacy, among *Whigs*, is only customary Cant. Such are content to allow a titular Supremacy to the Crown to crush the Church, but reserve to themselves a real Power paramount and superiour to both. The true Church-Man allows a Supremacy both to Church and State, within their proper Spheres; and tho' the State-Supremacy should usurp upon that of the Church, yet he professes to use no other Arms than Prayers and Tears. Are such the *Romish* Independency

dency and Supremacy? Pray, Sir, judge you now, what Occasion there is for all this senseless and ill-natured Clamour. I profess I am heartily sorry to see such wilful Mistakes and Insinuations, obvious to Detection and Censure, at least in the Age in which they are wrote, to fall from the Pen of a Bishop, who hath wrote the *History of the Reformation*, and even at the very Time he is publishing Corrections and Amendments of some things in it. It will raise strange Prejudices against the Performance, thus *in ipso limine deficere*.

P. 71. *But God be thanked, there are many among us, that stand upon the Watch-Tower, and give faithful Warning; that stand in the Breach, and make themselves a Wall for their Church and Country; that cry to God Day and Night, and lie in the Dust mourning before him, to avert those Judgments that seem to hasten towards us: then they only seem to hasten, and then they may seem not to hasten. I know not what Watch-men have been Mourning and Menacing so much for their Church and Country as his Lordship; except by a Bill of Comprehension, John Dunston, or the worthy Flying-Post, are of that*

that Number, according to the 23^d Article, expounded in a Catholick Sense. Whoever of the Clergy they be, or whatever they do, their Mourning is more in secret, it is not so visible and rampant. *They*, his Lordship and his Low Men, this being a second part of the Character his Lordship gives of a Low Church-Man, as the other was given before in his Preface to his *Pastoral Care*, *These*, in opposition to High-Church, or Church-Papists, in the preceding Page, *search into the Mystery of Iniquity that is working among us, and acquaint themselves with all that Mass of Corruption that is in Popery.* Now by this would not a Man think, that High Church-Men knew no more what Popery was, than the wild *Indians*? and yet I cannot but perswade my self they are as knowing of, and as skilful in obviating the Corruptions of Popery, as his Lordship and his Favourites. I will undertake to prove, that two Gentlemen of the High Form, whom his Lordship wisely charges (*risum teneas?*) with recommending the *Romish* Devotions, and the Union with the *Gallican* Church, have done more true Service against Popery, than all the Low Church-Men
in

in *England* at this Time put together; nay, tho' his Lordship should write half a dozen more Volumes of the *History of the Reformation*, and correct them every one, when he has done. *They have another Notion of the Worship of God, than to dress it up as a splendid Opera.* The Performances indeed of Divine Worship in the Church of *Rome* are too Theatrical, and in some reformed Places they are sordid: A due Mean between both Extremes adorns and becomes the House of God. I would not have the Temple a Stable, because Christ was born in one, nor a gaudy *Pantheon*, rather to attract the Eye, than enliven Devotion. *They have a just Notion of Priesthood, viz. That it is dependent as to the Exercise of its Spiritual Powers on the Secular; nay, that these Secular Powers can derive Spiritual ones to meer Lay men in case of Necessity, (vide Exposition on the 23d Article;)* and if they can do it but once in case of Necessity, they must radically have that Spiritual Power in them, for *nemo dat quod non habet*. As also that it is indifferent to the Constitution of Priesthood, whether it be Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Laical in the lowest degree,
for

for the Plea of Necessity will make it so here; and that it is not necessary to Baptism or Absolution; for it is not so, *if a Chimney-Sweeper can cleanse with the Laver of Baptism, or if Priestly Absolution be only declarative, and not judicial.* Much Good may it do his Lordship, and his Low Gentlemen, with their just Notion of Priesthood: A Priesthood of human, not divine Extraction, for we have learned otherwise out of the Scriptures, *that no Man (without Exception) taketh that Honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.*

P. 72. His Lordship thus Pathetically concludes, *And may I be of that Number, labouring while it is Day, and ready when the Night comes to lie down and rest in the Grave; or, if God calls me to it, to seal that Doctrine, which I have been practising now above Fifty Years, with my Blood.* I heartily wish all Happiness, Spiritual and Eternal to his Lordship; but I think such a large and unexampled Freedom with Church and State, which his Lordship hath taken, is not the way to it, unless *Render unto Cæsar, the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God, the things that are God's,* be Uncanonical Scripture,

or

or hath passed his Lordship's *Index Expurgatorius*. But what that Doctrine is, which he hath been now Preaching above Fifty Years, I profess no Man can certainly know; for his Lordship hath strenuously maintained some Doctrines, and as resolutely again opposed them, without being capable of refusing his former Arguments; as for instance, those of Absolute Non-Resistance of the State, and the Spiritual Independence of the Church, both which are at present under his Lordship's Anathema. If his Lordship's contradictory Doctrinal Assertions were to be columnised, (Debtor on one side, and Creditor on the other) they would swell up a pretty vendible Book; and the Ballance perhaps might run pretty even; for, for the last Twenty Five Years he hath preached and maintained Resistance and Dependence; and for good part of the Twenty Five preceding, the contrary Doctrines. I must declare to you, Sir, unless his Lordship makes a special Enumeration of them before his Death, which he apprehends is near, and will be violent, we cannot be certain what Doctrines he means; unless we are to account

account of the Validity of his Lordship's Doctrine, as we do of a Will; the last (whatever it be) is to stand, and be reputed the Author's legal Will and Testament.

Submitting these Remarks to the Correction of your much abler Pen, I subscribe,

S I R,

December 26, 1713.

St. Stephen's - Day,
a Martyr out of
Smithfield.

Your most Obliged,

Faithful Servant.

POST.

POSTSCRIPT.

THo' I fear, I have tired you already, Dear Sir, with a long Letter, yet since my Hand is in, I cannot forbear giving you an Additional Postscript, containing some few Reflections on some Passages in his Lordship's Preface before his late Volume of Sermons, &c. Indeed, I think, his Lordship hath not laid himself so open to Correction, within so small a Compass, in any of his Writings. It affords Matter plentiful enough both for Argument and Diversion; but for certain Reasons, I judge it not convenient to touch on all, that would require a severe Handling, but only to make some few Observations on some remarkable Particulars; especially on those, whereby his Lordship endeavours to vindicate his Patrons and their Cause, but miserably betrays both: Their Cause may

may be very good, but an Enemy could not have made it worse.

P. 3. *Revolution-Principles are now represented in such odious Colours.* By Revolution-Principles (which implies they were not Principles of Common or Statute Law before the Revolution, otherwise there would be no Occasion to call them Revolution-Principles, if they had had Foundation in our Law before the Revolution) the *Whigs* to a Man mean the Doctrine of Resistance. Now if by these Words, *Revolution-Principles*, his Lordship means Resistance, he arraigns that very Revolution he just before complained, *was after more than Four and Twenty Years brought under Debate, openly arraigned by some, and feebly justified by others*: For if absolute Non Resistance was the plainest Sense of all our Laws before the Revolution, (as I will venture my Life and Soul it was) to justify the Revolution by Resistance, and then to call it a Revolution-Principle, is to arraign the Revolution, not to defend it. The Convention wisely called it Abdication, (which is a voluntary and unforced Cession of Right, and they were in the right of it) and so endeavoured to conform it to the Laws, which would not

allow of resisting their Prince on any Pre-
tence whatever.

P. 5. After much Practise on that Court,
and many Removes made in it, they came
to a Decision, that all the Laws were the
King's Laws; and that the Execution of
the Law was only in the King, who was not
accountable to any Person for that. I sup-
pose his Lordship means, they were for
lodging a dispensing Power in the King,
so as that his Majesty might give Liberty
to any of his Subjects to neglect, or
transgress any Law, and his Dispensation
should justify them in it. Now tho' I
cannot be of Opinion, that the Prince
here hath such a dispensing Power, so
as to license the Irregularity, but only
to pardon the Obliquity after the Com-
mission of the Crime in the Subject for
what is already past, but not to indem-
nify him *de futuro* for what he shall do
of that nature, without a particular and
express Pardon, *posterior*, not *prior*, to
the Transgression of the Law; yet I still
believe it to have been, then at least,
unquestionable Law, *That all the Laws
were the King's Laws; and that the Exe-
cution of the Law was only in the King,
who* (might punish, and he only could
punish a Delinquent that had not a
F Pardon,

Pardon, and he) *was not accountable to any Person for that.*

P. 7. *Popish Bishops and Priests were sent openly about the Kingdom.* Well! but why did not King *William* punish such when he caught them, at least some of the most considerable of them? Must the old Law Maxim be inverted, and the Subject said to do no Wrong, but the King all? What was the Cause they were so gently dismissed by the Deliverer, since the Admission of *Popish Bishops and Priests* was an Article of Mal-Administration against King *James*? Was it because King *William* would not disoblige his new *Popish Allies*? if so, there was as much difference in the Case between King *William* and King *James*, as between Conscience and Policy. Out of a Principle of an erroneous Conscience, K. *James* brought in those *Popish Bishops and Priests*, which occasioned so great a Clamour against him, and when they had been more truly serviceable to others, than to him, they were civilly dismissed for their Pains. The Bishop should have let this alone.

P. 8. *But the Declaration, when twice repeated, so that it appeared the Court was resolved to pursue it, seemed to me to strike*

at all, and to alter our whole Constitution.

But what if it did not seem so to others? must his Lordship's private Judgment be the publick Standard of the Nation? Neither the Ecclesiastical Commission, nor the Case of *Magdalen-College*, nor the Embassy to *Rome*, nor the Toleration of *Popish* Bishops, (tho' very great Violations of the Law) were thought by him justifiable Causes of Abdicating King *James*: The Convention thought otherwise. In this Bishop's Judgment he was safe till the Declaration appeared, and that a second Time. If so, the King might have gone on with his particular Violations, tho' never so great, till we had not one Right left, so he had not emitted this or the like Declaration, and that more than once, and it would have been Rebellion to have resisted him.

Ibid. *The King's Authority is founded on Law.* With Submission this is a Mistake (*cujus contrarium est verum*) for the Law is founded on the King's Authority, unless there can be a Law before there is a Law-giver; an Effect before a Cause. Our Realms have been always Monarchical, and the Law is the publick Will of the Sovereign legally notified unto us: And had the Government been either

Oligarchical or Democratical, yet still the Law-givers must necessarily in Time have preceded the Law. But if his Lordship means, that the Royal Authority is restrained by the Consent of the Prince, or his Predecessors, it is true; yet still the King's Authority is not founded on Law; but the Prince hath suffered his Authority to be restrained in some Instances, of which Restriction some particular Laws proceeding even from the King's Authority, are Records and Monuments.

Again, *Ibid.* *A Subversion of Law, is the destroying that on which the King's Authority is founded, and by which it is maintained: so the turning a Legal Government into an Arbitrary one, (which is done every Time that a Prince limited in his Power, does one single Act contrary to Law) did put the Subjects to such Straits, that they saw they must either be Slaves, or try how their Liberties could be preserved.* If this be true, we need not have staid for the Declaration, much less for the Repetition of it, before we had passed the Abdication on King James. The Ecclesiastical Commission, or the Case of *Magdalen-College* singly, would have justified it; for those Instances were
Sub-

Subversions of Law, as much as the Declaration, *on which Law*, his Lordship saith, *the King's Authority is founded*; so the King's Authority being founded on Law, and that Law being subverted by the King's Violation of it, the King had no longer Authority, and he, who hath no Authority, may be resisted in unlawful Actions; so I see a partial Subversion can justify a forcible Opposition, as well as a total one. These Resistance-mongers cannot draw up a consistent Scheme, nor long agree with themselves. I could be almost tempted to say, could they draw up a Scheme exactly when to resist, and not before, which they would or could adhere to, I would commence *Whig* myself, which I would not do on small Terms.

Ibid. & p. 9. The Cases of the Natural and Civil Parent put by his Lordship will not advantage his Cause, as has been proved to his Lordship an hundred times; yet, like the common Hacks, he takes no Notice of it, nor endeavours to answer it. For suppose we might resist an implacable Parent, yet if his Cruelty cannot dissolve the Relation, his Lordship's Comparison destroys his own Argument. His Lordship pretends to prove,

that we may as well exempt our selves from Obedience to a Tyrannical Prince, as to a Tyrannical Parent; but if no Tyranny of a Parent can hinder but that he will bear the Relation and Authority of a Parent still; his Parallel will tell him the ill Usage of a Prince can no more dissolve the Relation of a Subject, so that his Argument ruins his own Cause. Let his Lordship extricate himself as well as he can: Yet if he were to write another Preface, he would say just the same, and let it shift for it self with unwary Readers, without taking Notice of the common, but unanswerable Answer.

Ibid. The Case is stronger in Subjects, who are under no Natural Tie, but only a legal one to their Prince. His Lordship here is wiser than the Laws, which call the Prince our Natural Sovereign Lord, and the People his Natural-born Subjects. If there was only a legal Sovereignty, and a legal Subjection, what occasion is there for the Word Natural, which seems opposed to Legal? but the Truth is, Sovereign and Subject were in Nature before Laws, and that is the Reason our Laws Recognise, not Establish, that Natural Relation.

Ibid. & p. 10. His Lordship justifies the Conduct of the *Dutch* from a Gossiping Story, of my Neighbour Such an one told my Neighbour Such an one so and so; from the Belief of an Alliance between *England* and *France*; and from the *French* King's Threats in case they should attempt to invade *England*. " O-
 " ther things occurred that made it
 " lawful for the States to assist him
 " with their Forces. The Earl of *Castle-*
 " *main*, the King's Ambassador at *Rome*,
 " pressed the Pope, and the Patron Car-
 " dinal *Cibo*, to admit the King to me-
 " diate a Reconciliation between the
 " Courts of *Rome* and *Versailles*; and
 " said, when that was brought about,
 " the two Kings would effectually serve
 " the Cause of the Church; and begin
 " with the Destruction of *Holland*. This
 " the Pope told to the Head of the *Im-*
 " *perial* Faction at *Rome*, who wrote it
 " to the Emperor; and the Emperor
 " wrote it to the Prince of *Orange*. "
 That the Ambassador of a *Popish* Prince should mediate a Reconciliation between the Pope and the *French* King, was natural enough; but how doth his Lordship prove the Motive to be the designed Destruction of the Protestant Religion,

beginning with *Holland*? Why, truly, if you will not take his Lordship's own Word here, you must expect no other Proof. The Pope said to the Head of the *Imperial* Faction; that Person acquainted his Master with it; the Emperor the Prince of *Orange*; and the Prince of *Orange* told it to his faithful Counsellor trusty Dr. *Burnet*. Here is the R——Pedigree. It seems then the Pope and the Emperor were extremely solicitous to preserve the Protestant Religion, which King *James* and the *French* King were about to destroy. I see now what Reason we had to call *Odeschalchi* the Protestant Pope, and the *Whiggs* to idolize the Memory of *Leopold* I. Is not this a pretty Story to be told? Some ill-natured People have said, the Pope and the Emperor were the chief Instruments of the Ruin of King *James*, and now this Writer of Secret Histories blabs it out, tho' his great Patron's Reputation suffers thereby: Friend or Foe it is all one to him, if he thinks he can serve his Cause at the present thereby. Had there been such a Motion made by the Ambassador, is it credible the Pope and the Emperor would have divulged it thus to the Prince of *Orange*, had there not been

been a good Understanding between those three Potentates before? I wonder what Motion another sort of Ambassador made to his Protestant Holiness. Are there not here the Pope, the *Dutch*, and the Prince?

Ibid. & p. 11. *So the States see a War with France unavoidable; and it being generally believed, that France and England were engaged in a strict Alliance, it was free for them (Monstrum horrendum!) to begin a War, where they hoped the Enemy was weakest.* Good God! May I never want, or have, such an Advocate. The Sense of all this is, That if I have but a Jealousy, that two of my Neighbours are combining to ruin me, I may fall upon the weakest, without any other Provocation, cut his Throat, or burn his House by way of Prevention. Shall any dare to question, whether the *Dutch* had not a just Cause of War with *France*? But, methinks, it is pretty odd, that it should be justifiable for them to invade another Prince's Dominion, only because it was generally believed, (and only then believed) that a strict Alliance was formed between that Nation and *France*; only because *Dover* was near unto, over-against, and smiled upon *Calais*. At this rate

rate any Prince may fall on another, tho' never so inoffensive, if he be not at War with his Enemy, for he must be at War or at Peace. The Bishop of *Sarum* would think himself hardly used, if I having a Quarrel with a great Friend of his, whom I could not so well grapple with, should make Reprisals on his Lordship's Estate and Effects. You see, Sir, here the Grounds of endless Jealousies and Fears. These things have, and ever will tear the World in pieces. Where they are entertained there can be no Peace, nor Honesty. But to proceed.

It is true, The Alliance was for some Time denied, (then they ought not to have armed, at least till they could have prov'd it) but at last it was owned by the French Ambassador in a Memorial that he gave in to the States, upon the Reports of their designing to invade England; in which he told them, that the Alliance between his Master, and the King of England was such, that he must look on what should be attempted against him, as done against himself. Now what doth all this signify, unless his Lordship proves the Alliance between the Crowns of England and France to have been to invade Holland, and destroy the Protestant Religion, of which

which, it seems, the Godly Pope and Emperor had made themselves Guarantees? This is like haling in our *Popish* Allies to stipulate for our Protestant Succession. Like to like. If it was not such an offensive League, it is nothing to the Case brought by the Bishop; but if the Case was purely friendly and defensive, as seems to be from the *French* Ambassador's Words cited by his Lordship, saying, *That the Alliance between his Master and the King of England was such, that he must look on what should be attempted against him, as done against himself; this was no other than what was justifiable, and is done every day between neighbouring Potentates and Nations.* The *Dutch* themselves are not without such Alliances; if they were they would not be long the High and Mighty States. And indeed the World would not be long troubled with these terrible Sieges and Battles, if Princes were more strict and conscientious in their Alliances, which would be an effectual Remedy against foreign Invasions and Usurpations, and domestic Rebellions. If Princes would be content with that Share of Dominion God and Nature have allowed them, and inviolably maintain Reciprocal Alliances

liances amongst themselves, and harbour no fugitive Rebels in their Dominions, (a much juster Cause of War, than mutual Fears and Jealousies) no Forreigner would dare to attempt to invade, or usurp, nor Subject to rebell; or if they did, the Devil with all his Legions could not help them out. What is observable of the Church, that it cannot be destroyed but by it self, will be found equally of the Temporal Governments of the World: But Usurpations will arise from the Ambition of Princes, and Rebellions from the unrestrained License of Subjects. But let us recapitulate this Advocate's Plea, as it is a Justification of the *Dutch*. The *Dutch* had a just Cause of War against us (tho' denying it at the same Time they were Arming, for you must know, it is Low-Country, as well as Low-Church Casuistry, to fall on without first demanding Satisfaction) because the Pr. of *Orange* told them, who wanted them, (if you will believe *Dr. Burnet*) that he had it infallibly from the Man, who cannot err, and the Emperor, that on a Peace concluded between the Pope and *France*, *Holland* should be attacked by the two Crowns: And that on their
de.

designed Invasion of *England*, the *French* Ambassador owned a strict Alliance between his Master and King *James*. So then these three things are good Causes of War: The bare Report of an Enemy; The Belief of a thing without Proof; and a Friendly Alliance between two Neighbouring Nations. If this be true either in Religion or Policy, the World must go to Loggerheads every Day, and he that hath the most Brazen Face, and Ironside, is like to fare the best.

Ibid. & p. 12. *The Court had resolved on, and had begun a total Subversion of our Constitution and Legislation.* How is that possible to have been known, till it had been effected? Is not beginning a *total Subversion* here, somewhat like beginning and ending a thing in the Middle of it? For the *Subversion* cannot be *total*, till it be fully compleated; and as long as there is an Hereditary Prince upon the Throne of *England*, according to our old Constitution, it can be no more totally subverted, than the *Jus Oeconomicum* can be entirely subverted, whilst the *Pater familias* is well, and enjoys his own Right and Powers. I do not speak this to encourage a Prince to break

break the Laws, (God forbid!) for tho' he be not accountable to Man, yet he is to God, and that an evil Prince will find to be the worst sort of Reckoning: But to shew, that if he does, it is hardly possible it should amount to a *total Subversion*, which is sometimes, (and but sometimes) an Occasional Argument of the Bishop of *Sarum*.

P. 16. & sequent. His Lordship gives a short History of the Desertion, calling it *Desertion upon Desertion*. I had rather it should be called Abdication, because, with all due Respect, the Convention called it so, which knew how to give proper Names to things: But I will not enter upon that Argument, the *Desertion* having been sufficiently *Discussed* long ago; but only observe to his Lordship, if such Circumstances should attend his Lordship at *Salisbury*, when the Religious Illuminations were begun in *Smithfield*, as once upon a Time did on a certain Person thereabouts and elsewhere, I believe, if his Lordship should flee to his beloved *Holland* for Protestant Safety and Protection, as the other did to *France* for *Popish*, he would change his Note, and call a Flight by any other Name than that of *Desertion*.

P. 17. His Lordship says, *He knew* (i. e. the Prince of Orange) *the Princess could never enjoy her self, if any such thing were done, which was the Imprisonment of her Father, to which his Highness was advised.* Alas! If this be true, what occasion doth this Advocate administer to the Enemies of that Princess's Memory, by reviving afterwards in a Sermon the Memory of the *la Hogue* Business, in that manner that he doth? for say they, how should she not be able to bear the Imprisonment of her Father, where possibly he might be in bodily Safety for some Time at least, and yet resolve to fight him at *la Hogue*, where he would be in Jeopardy every Moment of Perishing? and then he tells a Story (which no body knows but himself) of that Princess sending him a Text to Preach on, on the *Thanksgiving Day* for that Victory, by which King *James* and his Adherents are compared to *Pharaoh* and his *Egyptians*. Here his Lordship proves such an Advocate for the Princess, as he did before for the Prince of Orange, when he insinuated the Triple League between the Pope, the Emperor and his Highness. I desire his Lordship may not Preach my Funeral Sermon.

After

After he has thus reflected on the Princess and Prince of *Orange*, under Pretence of vindicating them, the Convention must come in for a Share of his delicious Strokes, when in the 18th Page his Lordship says, " They were to consider how to arrive at a Settlement, " as near the Constitution as was possible; (this by the way damns the celebrated Dr *Higden's utcunque* Possession) " as near the Constitution as was possible. " Here his Lordship insinuates, as if the Settlement was not exactly agreeable to the Constitution; now if it was not exactly agreeable to the Constitution, then the Constitution was altered, and some ill-natured People would perhaps call it a *total Subversion*, and where are we then? but the Convention knew what they did, and stand in no need of of his Lordship's awkward Justification.

P. 19. " The King by his Proceedings " had violated the Constitution in many Particulars, &c. " I thought it had been a *total Subversion*, but now I find it is only a partial one, and that, according to the Bishop, would not justify Resistance, as I have observed before.

P. 20. Speaking of the Queen's Brother, his Lordship saith, *The Prince of Orange did by his Declaration, refer the Enquiry into it to a Parliament. The King upon that did, by his sending the Pretender with the Queen out of the Kingdom, together with all those who were more immediately concerned in that supposed Birth, make it impossible to examine into it.* Now tho' the Pretender be Parliamentarily excluded from all Right, (nay, supposing the Legitimacy of his Birth were questionable) yet for a Person, who pretends to Accuracy and Correction in History, to say at this Time of the Day, and so record it to Posterity, that that Birth could not be enquired into, and examined as the poor Prince of Orange passionately desired, and declared it should, because King James had sent out of the Kingdom all those who were more immediately concerned in that supposed Birth, is so shameful a thing, that I am astonished at the Courage of the Historian: For it is well known, King James, according to the Prince's Declaration, publicly offered to refer the Examination of his Son's Birth to the Convention, which was not accepted, his Lordship

G

ship can tell the Reason why; and several Deponents *more immediately concerned* in the Knowledge of that Birth, not long after petitioned the same Lords and Gentlemen to be re-examined, in order to clear their own Reputations from vile Perjury, which had been objected to them. Perhaps, all those People were in *France*, when they thus addressed, and King *James* would not suffer them to come. And I appeal to his Lordship's own Memory refreshed, whether in all his Life, he is sure, he never acquiesced in certain Signs and Tokens of that Person's Birth. And so, Sir, I have done with this great Champion of Churches and States, only shall beg Leave to say,

That some Men, who designedly forsake Truth (as those infallibly do, who knowingly and with Perseverance contradict themselves) how undesignedly do they become Advocates for it!

Adden-

Addendum.

SINCE I wrote this Letter and Postscript, I have read part of a MS. History of the Memoirs of the Dukes of *Hamilton*, written by this Author, which is interlined with his own Hand in several Places. This Copy, which is forth-coming upon occasion, hath before it a Preface different from the printed one, in which he magnifies his own Veracity and Exactness, Moderation, Impartiality, and Dispassionateness in forming Histories: Which MS. was *prior* to that which he afterwards printed, in which I find several noble Characters in the Course of the History given to the Earl of *Lauderdale*, which are omitted in the published Volume. Now these were either true, or false; if false, why did he insert

G 2

them

them in the first Copy, which he designed for the Press; if true, why were they omitted in the latter? Was this becoming a veracious and disinterested Historian? Divine *Tully* would have told him, to have answered the Character of an Historian,

Ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat.

But here is the Mystery; when the Memoirs were published, the Lord *Lauderdale*, into whose Hands he had formerly put the other Copy, had fallen under his Mighty Displeasure, and so no Good must be said of him, or his Family, tho' never so necessary in the Course of his History. In these Concealments from the Publick, I suppose, he thought himself very happy; and doubtless would have redeemed, at any Price, his Famous Epistle Dedicatory to D. *Lauderdale*, prefixed to his *Scotch Conferences*, printed at *Glasgow* in 1673, but it was got too far into the World, and could not be retrieved. As to his Historical Veracity, Moderation, Impartiality, and Dispassionateness, on which

(101)

which he values himself so much in the MS. Preface, I shall say no more, but leave the World to judge of them by his late and daily Writings and Conversation.

FINIS.

(101)

BOOKS Printed for *J.*
Morphew, near *Stationers-*
Hall.

Some short Reflections upon Mr. *Bradbury's* late Libel, entituled, *The Afs and the Serpent*; wherein is shewn, The great Weakness of his shuffling Plea, for the Resistance of the Higher Powers. Published for the better Instruction of his Dissenting Congregation.

Antidotum Sarisburiense; Or, a free Expostulation with the Bishop of *Sarum*, (suited to the present Time) on some Passages in his Lordship's Preface, prefixed to the last Edition of his *Pastoral Care*. By a High-Church-Man.